



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SL  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,275	07/14/2003	L. Lloyd Williams	SWA01 P-106	6325
28101	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN AND BURKHART, LLP 2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E. P.O. BOX 888695 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695				ANWAH, OLISA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2645		

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/619,275	WILLIAMS, L. LLOYD
	Examiner Olisa Anwah	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in-
  - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
  - (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 14-18, 20-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holt, U.S. Patent No. 6,711,243 (hereinafter Holt).

Regarding claim 1, Holt discloses a method of providing direct access to a voice mail system (VMS) hosting a voice mail box associated with a service subscriber, the method comprising the steps of:

formulating a call set-up message for initiating the establishment of a call connection to the VMS, the call set-up message having a format reserved for a redirected call set-up

Art Unit: 2645

message issued by a service switching point (SSP) in response to an uncompleted call to the service subscriber; and issuing the call setup message into a common channel signaling (CCS) network to initiate the establishment of the call connection directly to the voice mail box of the service subscriber (see Figures 1-5 and columns 5-6).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Holt discloses the representative portion of the public switched telephone network in FIG. 1 includes a Service Transfer Point ("STP") 30. The STP is the packet switch in the Common Channel Interoffice Signaling (CCIS) system. Hence an STP infers CCIS. CCIS infers SS7 because CCIS is the technology that makes SS7 possible. Therefore Holt inherently teaches the claimed CCS and SS7 limitations. The claimed ISP and IAM limitations are also inherent. An ISUP is the control part of the SS7 protocol and in SS7 networks, the IAM is a mandatory message which initiates seizure of an outgoing circuit and which transmits address and other information relating to the routing and handling of call. With respect to the claimed limitation of inserting a redirecting number parameter see col. 5, line 65. Regarding the claimed limitation of an original called number parameter see col. 5, line 34. As for the claimed limitation of a redirection

Art Unit: 2645

information parameter see col. 5, lines 39-40. Holt also teaches inserting a directory number of the VMS into a called party number parameter (col. 5, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 6, see columns 3-8 and Figures 1-6.

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

Regarding claim 11, see Figures 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 14, see Figures 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 15, see Figures 3 and 5.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

Regarding claim 20, see Figures 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 21, see Figures 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 22, see Figures 3 and 5.

Regarding claim 24, see Figures 3 and 5.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2645

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt in view of Brunson, U.S. Patent No. 4,996,704 (hereinafter Brunson).

Regarding claim 4, Holt fails to teach a step of inserting a redirecting reason code into a redirection information parameter, the reason code being used by the VMS to select a voice mail prompt to play to the calling party. However Brunson discloses this limitation (see column 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the VMS taught by Brunson. This modification would have improved user friendliness by playing outgoing announcements to specific callers as suggested by Brunson (see abstract).

Regarding claim 9, Holt does not explicitly disclose inserting a redirecting reason code into a redirection information parameter, the redirecting reason code identifying the IAM as a request to leave a voice message with a direct to voice mail call. However Brunson discloses this limitation (col.

Art Unit: 2645

3, lines 10-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the redirecting reason code taught by Brunson. This modification provides information as to why the call was diverted and the nature of the call as suggested by Brunson (col. 3, line 25).

5. Claims 5, 10, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt in view of Russell, Travis. *Signaling System #7* New York: McGraw Hill, 2000 (hereinafter Russell).

With respect to claim 5, Holt fails to teach inserting a redirecting reason code into a redirection information parameter, the reason code being a default value indicating that the reasons for redirection is unknown or not available. However Russell discloses this limitation (see page 461). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the reason code taught by Russell. This modification allows for a parameter that provides information as to why the call was diverted and the nature of the call as suggested by Russell (page 496).

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

6. Claims 12, 13, 25-28 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt in view of Tov et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152402 (hereinafter Tov).

Regarding claim 12, Holt discloses receiving a connection request message that conforms to a predefined format and includes directory numbers for the requesting party, service subscriber and VMS (columns 3-8 and Figures 1-6). Holt fails to teach receiving over an Internet protocol (IP) connection, from a server on the Internet adapted to receive click-to-voice mail notifications from at least one worldwide web page. However Tov discloses this limitation (paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the web page taught by Tov. This modification allows a voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 13, see Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Regarding claim 26, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 27, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Regarding claim 28, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Regarding claim 36, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Regarding claim 37, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Regarding claim 38, see Figure 5 of Tov.

Regarding claim 39, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 40, see paragraph 0041 of Tov and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

7. Claims 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt view of D'Apuzzo et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,450,476 (hereinafter D'Apuzzo).

Regarding claim 30, Holt discloses a system for providing a directory service with a direct to voice mail option for voice mail system (VMS) service subscribers, comprising a directory service that permits a requesting party to communicate an identifier used to locate a directory record associated with the VMS service subscriber; and means for formulating a common

Art Unit: 2645

channel signaling initial address message (IAM) containing a redirecting number parameter to connect the requesting party directly to the voice mail box of the VMS service subscriber (columns 3-8 and Figures 1-6).

With further respect to claim 30, Holt fails to teach providing the requesting party with an option to be connected directly to the VMS service subscriber's voice mail box after the record is located. However D'Apuzzo discloses this limitation (see 170). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the providing method taught by D'Apuzzo. This modification would have made the directory service of Holt more user friendly by playing a recorded message before routing the call to a voice mail system as suggested by D'Apuzzo.

Regarding claim 31, see Figures 1 and 4 of D'Apuzzo. Also see Figures 3-5 of Holt.

Regarding claim 33, columns 3-8 and Figures 3-5 of Holt.

8. Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt combined with D'Apuzzo in further view of Tov.

As for claim 32, the combination of Holt and D'Apuzzo does not show the directory service is a directory service application instantiated on a worldwide web server adapted to interact with the requesting party through the Internet. However Tov discloses this limitation (paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved flexibility and universality by allowing a caller to connect to the subscriber or a subscriber service such as voice-mail, without having to become a subscriber him/herself (see paragraph 0041 of Tov).

Regarding claim 34, the Holt-D'Apuzzo combination discloses the CCN comprises a call control application (CCA) that is adapted to provide control functions to the CCN. However the combination does not teach the CCA is adapted to interface with an Internet Protocol (IP) network. However Tov discloses this limitation (paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Holt with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved flexibility and universality by allowing a caller to connect to the subscriber

Art Unit: 2645

or a subscriber service such as voice-mail, without having to become a subscriber him/herself (see paragraph 0041 of Tov).

9. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt combined with Tov in further view of Russell.

With respect to claim 29, the combination of Holt and Tov does not disclose the database is further adapted to supply the proxy server with a redirecting reason code in response to the query. However Russell discloses this limitation (see page 461). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Holt and Tov with the reason code taught by Russell. This modification allows for a parameter that provides information as to why the call was diverted and the nature of the call as suggested by Russell (page 496).

### ***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 703-305-4814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

Art Unit: 2645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah  
Patent Examiner  
September 18, 2004

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

